

REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 14, and 15 are all the claims now pending in the application. Claims 7, 11, 12 and 14 are being amended. Claim 13 is being canceled. Claim 15 is being added.

I. Specification Amendment

The second paragraph on page 17 of the application is being amended to correct a typographical error regarding a pair of reference numerals referring to the virtual adapters, which should be 70, 72 instead of 74, 76.

II. Claim Rejections—35 USC §112

The Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner stated that claim 7 is a single means claim, indicating that claim 7 recites the “claim element ‘an individually associated routing table’ as a means for performing a specified function ‘providing access to a network from a source.’” However, the Examiner has misconstrued the claim. It is the *network adapter* that provides the means for performing a function of providing access to a network from a source, not the individually associated routing table. Claim 7 is also being amended to recite the further element of means that the network adapter “comprises an individually associated routing table for the source to access the network adapter as a default destination route.” Support for the amendment is found on page 15 of the application in the last paragraph.

The Applicant submits that claim 7 now satisfies the requirements of 35 USC §112, first paragraph.

III. Claim Rejections—35 USC §101

The Examiner rejected claims 11-14 under 35 USC §101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicant hereby amends claims 11, 12, and 14; cancels claim 13; and adds claim 15 to recite proper statutory embodiments of the invention, specifically the tangible embodiment of relaying of traffic from a source to a target destination in a communications network. Support for claim 15 is found on page 5, first paragraph, of the Specification. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 11-14 under 35 USC §101 be withdrawn.

IV. Claim Rejections—35 USC §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5 and 7-14 under 35 USC §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Shen (US 2004/0013120 A1).

To be anticipating, a prior art reference must disclose "each and every limitation of the claimed invention...." In re Paulsen, 30 F.3d 1475, 1478-79, 31 USPQ2d 1671, 1673 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Claim 1

With regard to the rejection of claim 1, the Applicant respectfully disagrees, and submits that Shen fails to disclose the elements of the claimed invention. Specifically, Shen fails to

disclose providing “at least one second routing table defining a second destination, which *second destination is individually associated with said at least one second network adapter...*” Claim 1, emphasis added. As discussed in the Specification of the present application and illustrated in Fig. 3, “[e]ach routing table 60, 62, is individually associated with one of network adapters 20, 22, 24...” Specification, p. 15, last paragraph. Shen discloses no such organizational structure where a destination is individually associated with a respective network adapter, as in claim 1. The Examiner cites to Fig. 4 of Shen and specifically to routing table 407A as a “second” routing table, but the routing table 407A is the routing table for virtual router VR-B 403B, while routing table 405 is the routing table for virtual router VR-A 403A. However, Shen does not disclose that the routing tables are individually associated with their respective virtual routers, as described in claim 1. Thus, Shen does not disclose the element of claim 1 of providing a second destination that is individually associated with at least one second network adapter.

Furthermore, Shen fails to disclose “wherein the step of relaying includes a step of selecting one of the first and second routing tables,” as recited in claim 1. The Examiner cites to Fig. 4 and states that when multiple destinations are listed, such as ED1 or ED2, “the packet is relayed using the first or second routing table as illustrated in Fig. 4.” Office Action, p. 6. However, Shen does not disclose the actual selection of one of the first and second routing tables. Instead, Shen discloses, in paragraph [0028], where a forwarding module 207 uses a forwarding table 219 to look up the destination of a packet 201 and forwards the packet 201 to an egress port that corresponds to the outgoing interface I/F1. At no point does Shen discuss selection of a first and second routing table to relay traffic to a target destination. Therefore, Shen additionally fails to disclose the element of claim 1 of relaying including a step of selecting one of the first and second routing tables.

As Shen fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1, the Applicant submits that the rejection under 35 USC §102(e) cannot be maintained.

Claim 3

The Applicant refers the Examiner to the arguments presented above regarding claim 1, and submits that claim 3 is allowable at least based on its dependency to claim 1.

Claim 4

The Applicant refers the Examiner to the arguments presented above regarding claim 1, and submits that claim 4 is allowable at least based on its dependency to claim 1. Additionally, the Applicant submits that Shen fails to disclose the element of claim 4 “wherein each virtual network adapter is individually associated with a third routing table.” The Examiner cites to Fig. 5 and paragraphs [0050] – [0051] of Shen, which appear to teach away from the elements of claim 4. While claim 4 teaches providing that each virtual network adapter *is individually associated* with a third routing table, Shen teaches that “a virtual router uses *more than one* VR forwarding table, VR interior gateway routing table, and/or VR exterior gateway routing table.” Shen, para. [0051] (emphasis added). Further, Shen teaches that “...a single external and/or internal routing process is *shared by different* virtual routers.” Shen, para. [0051] (emphasis added). Therefore, Shen appears to not only lack the teaching of a virtual network adapter individually associated with a routing table, but Shen appears to teach away from such a configuration, suggesting sharing tables amongst routers.

For at least these reasons, the Applicant submits that Shen fails to disclose each and every element of claim 4.

Claim 5

The Applicant refers the Examiner to the arguments presented above regarding claim 1, and submits that claim 5 is allowable at least based on its dependency to claim 1. The Applicant also submits that Shen fails to disclose “wherein the third routing table includes next hop and interface entries pointing to at least one of the following: *another routing table* or a real network adapter.” The Examiner cites to paragraphs [0028] – [0029] of Shen as teaching the elements of claim 5, but the cited section of Shen only discloses forwarding a packet to another virtual router, rather than another routing table, as in claim 5. Therefore, the Applicant submits that Shen fails to disclose each and every element of claim 5.

Claims 7-8

The Applicant refers the Examiner to the arguments presented above regarding claim 1, and submits that Shen fails to teach a network adapter that comprises “*an individually associated* routing table for the source to access the network adapter as a default destination route,” as taught by the amended claim 7 (emphasis added). As Shen fails to disclose individually associating a routing table with a destination and a network adapter, Shen cannot disclose the elements of claims 7 and 8. For at least these reasons, the Applicant submits that Shen fails to teach each and every element of claims 7 and 8.

Claims 9-15

As the Examiner suggests that claims 9-14 are rejected under similar rationale to claim 1, the Applicant further submits that claims 9-12, 14, and new claim 15, are allowable for the reasons stated by the Applicant above with regard to claim 1. Claim 13 has been canceled. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 9-14 be withdrawn.

V. Claim Rejections—35 USC §103

Claim 2

The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen in view of Killian (US 6,064,671).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees, and submits that the combination of Killian and Shen fail to teach the elements of claim 2. The Examiner admits that Shen does not teach that the first and second routing tables define said first and second destinations as default destinations which are used for traffic relay in any default situation. Killian merely teaches a definition of a default entry in a routing table, but does not provide any teaching, suggestion, or motivation for having a *first* and *second* routing tables define a *first* and *second* destinations as default destinations to be used for traffic relay in *any default situation*. Killian makes no mention of using multiple routing tables or individually associating a first and second routing table with a first and second default destination, as described in claim 2. One would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of Shen and Killian to arrive at the elements of claim 2, as Killian and Shen fail to teach the use of first and second routing tables defining first and second destinations as default destinations. The Applicant submits that Killian and Shen, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach, suggest, or provide motivation for the elements of claim 2, and therefore fail to make it obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the definition of a default entry in Killian with the teachings of Shen to arrive at the elements of claim 2.

Furthermore, the Applicant refers the Examiner to the arguments submitted above with regard to claim 1, and submits that as claim 1 is allowable, so too is claim 2.

Claim 6

The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen in view of Zhou (US 2002/0138578).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees, and submits that Zhou does not teach the step of selecting a routing table being triggered by the source, as Zhou is directed not to relaying traffic in a communications network, but establishing a communications port on a local machine. The Examiner admits that Shen does not teach the step of selecting a routing table being triggered by the source. The teaching of Zhou, of a client application creating a socket, cannot be equated with the step of selecting a routing table triggered by the source, as Zhou fails to describe any of the elements of the claimed invention, such as a routing table or a destination. Therefore, the Applicant submits that there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Zhou with those of Shen to arrive at the elements of claim 6.

Furthermore, the Applicant refers the Examiner to the arguments submitted above with regard to claim 1, and submits that as claim 1 is allowable, so too is claim 6.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott H. Davison/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (619) 238-3545
Facsimile: (619) 238-4931

Scott H. Davison
Registration No. 52, 800

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 3, 2007